

EXHIBIT 60

1 Scott R. Mosko (State Bar No. 106070)
2 FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
3 GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.
Stanford Research Park
3300 Hillview Avenue
Palo Alto, California 94304
4 Telephone: (650) 849-6600
Facsimile: (650) 849-6666

6 Attorneys for Defendant PACIFIC
NORTHWEST SOFTWARE

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

12 | FACEBOOK, INC.

CASE NO. C 07-01389 RS

Plaintiff,

14 ||| V.

**DEFENDANT PACIFIC NORTHWEST
SOFTWARE'S RESPONSE TO FIRST
SET OF INTERROGATORIES**

15 CONNECTU LLC, (now known as CONNECTU
16 INC.) PACIFIC NORTHWEST SOFTWARE,
INC., WINSTON WILLIAMS, AND DOES 1-25,

Defendants.

1 **PROPOUNDING PARTY:** Plaintiff FACEBOOK, INC.
2 **RESPONDING PARTY:** Defendant PACIFIC NORTHWEST SOFTWARE
3 **SET NO.:** ONE (Nos. 1-4)

5 **TO PLAINTIFF AND ITS ATTORNEYS OF RECORD:**

6 Pursuant to Rule 33 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, Defendant, Pacific Northwest
7 Software ("PNS"), hereby responds and objects to the First Set of Interrogatories propounded by
8 Facebook Inc. ("FACEBOOK") as follows:

9 **GENERAL OBJECTIONS**

10 1. Responding party objects to each interrogatory and to the definitions and instructions
11 to the extent they seek to impose obligations that are broader than or inconsistent with the Federal
12 Rules of Civil Procedure, the Civil Local Rules, and the Court's Order allowing Expedited
13 Discovery.

14 2. Responding party objects to each interrogatory, and to the definitions and instructions
15 to the extent they seek the disclosure of information protected by the attorney-client privilege,
16 attorney work-product doctrine, or any other applicable privilege or protection, as provided by any
17 applicable law. Responding party does not intend to produce such privileged or protected
18 documents or information, and the inadvertent disclosure of such is not to be deemed a waiver of any
19 privilege. Responding party expressly reserves the right to object to the introduction at trial or any
20 other use of such information that may be inadvertently disclosed. In addition, Responding party
21 objects to the interrogatories and all definitions and instructions to the extent they seek and/or
22 require Responding party to produce a privilege log for documents or information falling within the
23 attorney-client privilege or work-product doctrine, if such documents or information were created
24 after the date that this lawsuit was filed.

25 3. Responding party objects to each interrogatory and all other definitions and
26 instructions to the extent they are vague, overly broad, unduly burdensome, exceed the boundaries of
27 discoverable information, or fail to describe the information sought with the required reasonable
28 particularity.

1 4. Responding party objects to each interrogatory and all definitions and instructions to
2 the extent the burden or expense of the proposed discovery outweighs its likely benefit, given the
3 needs of the case, the amount in controversy, the parties' resources, the importance of the issues at
4 stake in the litigation, and the importance of the proposed discovery in resolving the issues.

5 5. Responding party objects to each interrogatory and all other definitions and
6 instructions to the extent they seek information that is confidential financial, proprietary, trade secret
7 or other confidential or competitively sensitive business information relating to Responding party or
8 any third party. Responding party reserves the right to object that certain information is so
9 confidential and sensitive that it will not be produced even pursuant to a protective order.

10 6. Responding party objects to each interrogatory and all definitions and instructions to
11 the extent they seek information not in Responding Party's custody or control.

12 7. Responding party objects to the interrogatory and all other definitions and
13 instructions to the extent they seek information that is beyond the scope of this litigation, is not
14 relevant, or that falls outside the parameters of discoverable information under the California Code
15 of Civil Procedure.

16 8. Responding party has not yet completed its investigation, collection of information,
17 discovery, and analysis relating to this action. The following response is based on information
18 known and available to Responding party at this time. Responding party reserves the right to
19 modify, change, or supplement its response and to produce additional evidence at trial. Responding
20 party's agreement to furnish information in response to Plaintiff's interrogatories shall not be
21 deemed as an admission regarding the relevance of the requested information, nor is it intended to
22 waive any right to object the admissibility of such at trial.

23

24 **OBJECTIONS TO DEFINITIONS**

25 1. Responding party objects to all definitions to the extent they impose burdens on
26 responding different or greater than those provided in the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and the
27 Civil Local Rules.

1 2. Responding party objects to all definitions to the extent that they are burdensome,
2 oppressive and unnecessary.

3 3. Responding party objects to the definition of "ConnectU" as overly oppressive,
4 burdensome, and effectively creating a subpart, compound and/or complex interrogatory. When the
5 word "ConnectU" is used in an interrogatory, Responding party shall assume it means only the
6 limited liability company entitled ConnectU L.L.C.

7 4. Responding party objects to the definition of "Harvardconnection", as vague,
8 uncertain and overbroad. When the word Harvardconnection is used in an interrogatory,
9 Responding party shall assume it means only the unincorporated entity once called
10 "Harvardconnection".

11 5. Responding party objects to the definition of "Facebook" as vague, uncertain,
12 overbroad and unintelligible. When the word Facebook is used in an interrogatory, Responding
13 party shall assume it means only the entity identified in the complaint.

14 7. Responding party objects to the phrase "Pacific Northwest Software" as uncertain,
15 overbroad and unintelligible. When the phrase "Pacific Northwest Software" is used in an
16 interrogatory, Responding party will assume it means the entity incorporated as Pacific Northwest
17 Software, Inc.

18 8. Responding party objects to definition of Winston Williams as uncertain, overbroad
19 and unintelligible. When the name Winston Williams is used in an interrogatory, Responding party
20 will assume it means the individual named in the First Amended Complaint.

OBJECTIONS TO INSTRUCTIONS

22 1. Responding party objects to the definition of "Identify" found in paragraphs 2, 3 and
23 5 of the "Instructions", as vague, overlybroad, compound and complex.

24 2. Responding party objects to the Instructions, found at paragraphs 6, 7 and 8. In
25 addition to these instructions being vague, they would make the interrogatories compound, complex
26 and effectively cause each interrogatory to contain subparts, in violation of the Federal Rules of
27 Civil Procedure.

1 3. Responding party objects to Instruction No. 10 in that it would make the
2 interrogatories compound, complex and effectively cause each interrogatory to contain subparts, in
3 violation of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

RESPONSES AND OBJECTIONS

INTERROGATORY NO. 1:

6 Describe in detail AND IDENTIFY ALL contacts YOU have had with individuals,
7 customers, OR businesses in California, including the PERSONS contacted, the location AND time
8 where any such contact OR event occurred, the manner of contact, AND the subject matter of the
9 contact OR event.

RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 1:

11 Responding party objects to this Interrogatory as vague, over broad, compound and complex.
12 This interrogatory also calls for speculation. This interrogatory also seeks confidential and/or
13 proprietary information. This Interrogatory also comprises at least four separate interrogatories.
14 This interrogatory further calls for a narrative. Subject to these objections and the general objections
15 and the objections to the definitions and instructions incorporated herein, Responding party answers
16 as follows: Responding party has communicated with the following vendors, whom responding
17 party is informed and believes are located in California: David Perkins, Fred Pampo, Greg Deacon,
18 Joel Stair, Keith Benedict and Samuel Oh. Responding party has also had contact with the following
19 customers, whom responding party is informed and believes are located in California: Chad
20 Kalebic, Chad Farrell, Jose Escobar, Jonathan Orsay, Tina Morkert, Michele Miller, James Zinkand,
21 Scott Kozinchik, and an individual or individuals from City Ticket Exchange and Shapely Shadow,
22 Inc.

INTERROGATORY NO. 2:

24 IDENTIFY percentage of revenues based upon goods or services offered, licensed, sold or
25 provided by YOU to California residents or businesses as compared to sales goods or services
26 offered, licensed, sold or provided by YOU to non-California residents or businesses.

1 **RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 2:**

2 Responding party objects to this Interrogatory as vague, over broad, compound and complex.
3 This interrogatory also seeks confidential and/or proprietary information. Responding party objects
4 to the phrase "California residents or businesses" as vague and uncertain and calling for a legal
5 conclusion and speculation. Subject to these objections and the general objections and the
6 objections to the definitions and instructions incorporated herein, Responding party answers as
7 follows: Responding party has generated approximately \$8,000,000 since its existence. Responding
8 party is informed and believes that its customer AST may be located in California, and has paid
9 Responding party \$103,656; that its customer Chadstar may be located in California, and has paid
10 Responding party \$47,437; that its customer Chula Vista Elementary School may be located in
11 California, and has paid Responding party \$64,449; that its customer City Ticket Exchange may be
12 located in California, and has paid Responding party \$37,000; that its customer ExamKrackers.com
13 may be located in California and has paid Responding party \$83,270; that its customer Know-the-
14 Course may be located in California and has paid Responding party \$30,500; that its customer
15 Michele Miller may be located in California and has paid Responding party \$3,375; that its customer
16 New Country Financial may be located in California and has paid Responding party \$12,150; that its
17 customer Nomad Cows may be located in California and has paid Responding party \$12,000; that its
18 customer Shapely Shadow, Inc. may be located in California and has paid Responding party \$1,440.

19 **INTERROGATORY NO. 3:**

20 IDENTIFY ALL Internet ("IP") Addresses and URLs that YOU used OR accessed to obtain
21 any data from any website associated with Facebook, Inc. (including but not limited to the
22 www.thefacebook.com and www.facebook.com), the purpose for the use or access, and ALL dates
23 in which such URLs or IP addresses were accessed by YOU.

24 **RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 3:**

25 This interrogatory is unintelligible. It further assumes facts not in evidence. This
26 interrogatory is compound and complex and comprises at least three separate interrogatories. The
27 phrase "obtain any data from any website associated with Facebook, Inc." is vague and uncertain.
28 Subject to these objections and the general objections and the objections to the definitions and

1 instructions incorporated herein, Responding party answers as follows: Responding party has no
2 knowledge that will enable it to answer this interrogatory. Responding party believes Winston
3 Williams may have information regarding this interrogatory.

4 **INTERROGATORY NO. 4:**

5 IDENTIFY all instances (including dates) when YOU distributed email communications to
6 email addresses obtained originally from FACEBOOK, including identification of ALL email
7 addresses or PERSONS in California.

8


9 **RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 4:**

10 This interrogatory is unintelligible. It further assumes facts not in evidence. Subject to these
11 objections and the general objections and the objections to the definitions and instructions
12 incorporated herein, Responding party answers as follows: Responding party has no knowledge that
13 will enable it to answer this interrogatory. Responding party believes Winston Williams may have
14 information regarding this interrogatory.

15 As to Objections:

16 Dated: June 8, 2007

17 FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
18 GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

19 By: 

20 Scott R. Mosko
21 Attorneys for Defendant
22 Pacific Northwest Software



FINNEGAN
HENDERSON
FARABOW
GARRETT &
DUNNER LLP

Stanford Research Park • 3300 Hillview Avenue • Palo Alto, CA 94304-1203 • 650.849.6600 • Fax 650.849.6666
www.finnegan.com

MATT TUELLER

650.849.6696

matthew.tueller@finnegan.com

June 15, 2007

VIA Regular Mail

Monte Cooper, Esq.
Orrick, Herrington & Sutcliffe LLP
1000 Marsh Road
Menlo Park, CA 94025

TheFacebook, Inc. v. ConnectU LLC, et al.
U.S. District Court, No. Dist. of CA, Case No. 5:07-01389

Dear Mr. Cooper:

Please find enclosed a verification by John Taves to Defendant Pacific Northwest Software's Response to First Set of Interrogatories served on June 11, 2007 via e-mail.

Sincerely,

Matthew Tueller
Litigation Clerk

Enclosure

cc: Mr. Scott Mosko

VERIFICATION

JOHN TAVES, under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States, declares as follows:

1. That he is the authorized agent of Pacific Northwest Software;

2. That he has read DEFENDANT PACIFIC NORTHWEST SOFTWARE'S RESPONSE TO FIRST SET OF INTERROGATORIES and knows the contents thereof, and informed and believes them to be true and correct.

Executed on the 11th day of June 2007.

John Taves

